AFTERNOON SESSION 1 (1:54 p.m.)2 MR. LERNER: Before we start on issues C6 3 and C17, I just want to note I think in the schedule that we have, we may have given Mr. Smith is only 4 5 available today; is that right? MR. SMITH: Yes. 6 MS. NEWMAN: 7 Yes. He's also involved in issue 8 MR. LERNER: C21 and C34, that we may flip-flop that one with 9 issue C16, just to make sure if we run over, it 10 won't be on something that he needs to be here. 11 12 MS. NEWMAN: Thank you. Thank you very 13 much. MR. LERNER: We will now get started on 14 issue C6, which both sides have waived 15 cross-examination, but Staff has some questions. 16 Mr. Clift has already been sworn in and 17 introduced. If you want to introduce yourself and 18 the court reporter will swear you in. 19 MR. GREEN: Sure, I'm William Green, I'm a 20 senior product manager with Verizon, doing E911. 21 Whereupon, 22

WILLIAM GREEN

was called as a witness and, having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

MR. KOERNER: Mr. Green, I had a question for you about your rebuttal testimony, page 4, lines 9 through 12, where you say that Verizon's costs do not increase simply because Cav does not provide support to central offices, Verizon's E911 tandem, Verizon must still provide -- could you explain to me how Verizon is providing a transport service for a call that Cavalier transports to the Verizon E911 tandem?

MR. GREEN: Well, Verizon -- I would have to -- what page was that in my rebuttal?

MR. KOERNER: Page 4, lines 9 through 12 of your rebuttal.

MR. GREEN: Yes. All I'm essentially saying there is that we provide transport from our own end offices -- not from Cavalier's end office but from our own end offices, into the E911 tandem. At the E911 tandem, what we do is take all of the calls from our own end offices, as well as all of

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

the other CLEC offices, including Cavalier's. We consolidate them and we send them on to the PSAP from there.

MR. KOERNER: So you're not saying you are incurring a cost for the portion of that call that Cavalier is transporting?

MR. GREEN: Oh, no.

MR. KOERNER: Okay, that's all.

MR. LERNER: Anybody else have any

10 questions?

MS. NATOLI: I'm not sure what specific provision of your testimony it is, that's why I was looking for it, but Verizon says that it cooperates with Cavalier to make -- to provide information to the PSAPs or to give Cavalier information necessary to contact the PSAPs.

Does that -- does your view of that cooperation include providing information about what parts of the network you all provide or how calls traverse your network, and then -- or come from Cavalier's network to your network and then to the PSAP, such that the PSAP clearly understands, you

know, that there really are two carriers involved, where the customer originates and that quite possibly it does originate over facilities that Cavalier has dedicated to 911?

MR. GREEN: Let me try to answer the question. What we have is we have a whole organization that's set up to support each one of the states. There are service managers, and when needed, the service managers intervene on behalf of the CLECs. That happens many times but it hasn't happened so often recently, because people are much more aware of what the requirements are.

When that statement was put in originally into the interconnection agreement, it was when we were all starting out. And at that time, we did accompany CLECs many times, just to -- PSAPs, excuse me, just to explain to them what the relationship was and how a CLEC would interconnect with us and how that would then lead into our network, go through our database, and the call would ultimately end up in the PSAP's hand with the information that's needed.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

MS. NATOLI: Okay. And I guess just as a follow-up to that, what is it that you understand Cavalier to be asking for in their cooperating with you, you know, to work with the PSAPs, just with respect to resolving payment disputes?

MR. GREEN: Yeah, my interpretation is just that, yes, that what they're asking us to do is to go in with them and support their own costs and rate bases for the services that they provide. And I think the important thing to remember here is that we deal with literally thousands of CLECs and we deal with thousands -- literally thousands of PSAPs, and in all cases, we support our own rates, through either contracts or tariffs in the individual jurisdictions. It would be a very, very difficult task for us to go in and support everybody else's rates, and we simply wouldn't have the knowledge to do that.

MS. NATOLI: Cavalier, when you're asking for this kind of cooperation, what is it that you're envisioning, aside from the -- what the original provision was there for, just to make the initial

contacts with the PSAP to know which one was the appropriate one to deal with? What is it that you're asking them specifically to do?

MR. CLIFT: Well, foremost, I think it's important to let the PSAPs know that we're providing 911 services in tandem with Verizon, and that we're both each an essential partner in the provisioning of that service, so they -- the PSAPs understand exactly which carrier is performing which functions. So that's more or less on the technical side.

And then on the compensation side, to sit down and explain with the PSAPs how the billing is going to work for those associated functions and services that each of the parties are providing, and if the PSAPs have any questions with respect to that and any concerns with respect to any potential double-billing situations for duplicate functions that may arise, that we can address those questions and find a resolution, as opposed to conflict.

MS. NATOLI: And do you not have these arrangements with the PSAPs governed by agreements with them or written documents? Is that not

1	required with PSAPs in Virginia?
2	MR. CLIFT: Cavalier doesn't have any
3	written individual contracts with any of the PSAPs.
4	We do have a 911 tariff.
5	MS. NATOLI: Right.
6	MR. CLIFT: That's in lieu of individual
7	contracts we have.
8	MS. NATOLI: And this is for both of you.
9	Is that the typical way that a CLEC in Virginia
10	deals with 911, with the PSAPs? I ask that because
11	in some jurisdictions, you're required to have an
12	agreement, each person with the PSAP. But it sounds
13	like Virginia is not such a state. Do you, Verizon,
14	have an agreement, particular agreements with the
15	PSAPs that govern your relationship?
16	MR. GREEN: I'm not sure whether we have a
17	particular agreement that governs it, but we do have
18	tariffs in the state.
19	MS. NATOLI: Okay. Then probably you
20	don't. Okay. That's all I have.
21	MR. LERNER: Okay.
22	MR. GREEN: May I offer one other point?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

MR. LERNER: Okay.

MR. GREEN: Just to go back to your question. The particular issue that's being discussed here is one in which the Virginia SCC has opened up rulemakings. And I just wanted to make it clear that all of this is being discussed at those hearings. In fact, comments were filed last Friday, and I think we -- both parties agreed that we were interested in unbundling the services. And I think that would take care of most of this issue.

MS. NATOLI: Okay.

MR. LERNER: Anything to add to that?

MR. CLIFT: Well, I guess it's already in my testimony and rebuttal testimony that yes, there is a proceeding. Yes, Verizon did say that they would unbundle their services, and Verizon did mention that in the end game, the 911 price is going to go up due to the presence of competition in their comments that they filed, which hopefully is not going to be the case.

But we're faced right now with some revenue issues. I know with Chesterfield County,

1	there's amounts for Cavalier of roughly \$35,000 that
2	right now Chesterfield County is deducting from the
3	Verizon bill. And I don't know if Verizon has
4	disputed that with Chesterfield or not. Certainly,
5	today we have some revenue impacts associated with
6	this in dealing with the PSAPs. So until the
7	Commission makes that commission and determination
8	and changes the rules, and changing the rule is one
9	thing but going through another tariff proceeding
10	could be another lengthy process. So it may be a
11	year, two years down the road.
12	In the meantime, though, we've got an
13	issue that we're asking the Commission to address.
14	MR. LERNER: All right. I guess do you
15	want the testimony?
16	MS. NATOLI: Yes.
17	MR. PERKINS: Mr. Clift's testimony has
18	already been moved.
19	MS. NEWMAN: Verizon would move for direct
20	testimony of William H. Green, III which was filed
21	on September 23, 2003 to be accepted into evidence

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

and marked as Verizon Exhibit Number 5. We would

1	also move into evidence the rebuttal testimony of
2	William H. Green, III, dated October 9, 2003 and
3	marked as Verizon Exhibit Number 6.
4	MR. LERNER: So admitted.
5	(Verizon Exhibits 5 and 6 received.)
6	MR. LERNER: Witnesses for issue C17?
7	Mr. Smith has already testified and has already been
8	sworn. Do you want to introduce yourself?
9	MR. ZITZ: I'm Mark Zitz with Cavalier
10	Telephone.
11	Whereupon,
12	MARK ZITZ
13	was called as a witness and, having first been duly
14	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
15	MR. LERNER: And I believe we are it's
16	Cavalier oh, they have waived, never mind. Both
17	sides have waived, so it's the Staff, and Mr. Maher
18	will begin.
19	MR. MAHER: I'll start off with some
20	questions for Cavalier, for Mr. Zitz. In your
21	affidavit, you give sort of a few specific examples

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

contacts. Does Cavalier have some sort of sense of the magnitude of this problem or anything beyond sort of these specific examples you cite?

MR. ZITZ: Since I have submitted my testimony, I am aware of other examples, and they all follow within the same line. And that is from my point of view, the retail part of Verizon has access to customer information for Cavalier's customers. And I think some good examples of this fall in the directory organization within Verizon.

In addition to the examples I've already supplied in my testimony, there are other situations where Verizon will somehow get information that someone is trying to move their service over to Cavalier. At that point they make contact with that customer and they say if you don't pay your directory contract up front or in full, you won't be listed in the directory, or they might say -- in the five examples that I've found, they might say the directory is closing sooner than the published date, so therefore you better not do anything, because you run the risk of not being included in the directory.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

In another situation or two other situations, Verizon intruded on what we call a win-back. A win-back is a situation where a customer makes a decision to return to Verizon from Cavalier; in other words, they want to go back. And in the two examples that I have, Verizon circumvented its own win-back process and essentially took the customer -- took the customers from Cavalier earlier than the date that they should have, and it really forced Cavalier to release the customer back to Verizon sooner than the date.

And the problem generated by that is more than just a paper record change. I mean, it is a physical activity that affects the customer's dial tone. So in these two examples, we were fortunate to be able to prevent the customers from losing dial tone.

I think in my testimony, I made it very clear that there were some situations involving CSRs, and I in particular on a particular day requested information about an Allegiance customer who was coming over to Cavalier. So I asked

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

somebody to pull information on this and lo and behold, I got a complete customer listing of every Allegiance customer or every end user that was served by a loop that Verizon was leasing to Allegiance. It was some listing of approximately 6000 customers.

So in the examples that I've just given you, hopefully I'm demonstrating that the information is accessible to people who really shouldn't have a need for it, but they are getting access to it, and they're using it to the detriment of Cavalier, and to the detriment of Cavalier, and to the detriment of Cavalier's customers.

MR. MAHER: So in terms of like the CSR example, that's something that you have experience with with regard to Allegiance, but have you observed any instances where, to the extent you could tell, that Verizon has gotten access to a CSR through a similar type of problem, or is it just you don't know how they're getting access?

MR. ZITZ: Well, in this case Verizon has -- it's Verizon CSR. I guess the point that I

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

was trying to make is I was getting access to their

Allegiance customer database and it was open for

anybody in the CLEC community to get.

So it made me question how secure our records were with Verizon. And if something was that blatant and the leakage was so prevalent, then it's no wonder that other customer information within Verizon is accessible to Verizon employees.

MR. MAHER: So your concern is sort of with regard to that specific issue, is not -- is not that other CLECs are getting access to this other information, it's that Verizon retail might have similar access, is that the --

MR. ZITZ: I'm concerned about both.

Another CLEC could obtain information and use it to go after my customer base, or a Verizon employee could inappropriately access that information and go after the Cavalier customer base. This is information that really should be protected. I guess I want to ask you, was I clear with my example there or would you like me to go through --

MR. MAHER: No, no, I think that's clear.